

REMARKS

There are claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 13 and 14 pending in the application.

The examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 8 and 9 as being anticipated by Glass et al. as set forth in prior Office action paper 9, paragraph 3, applicants arguments filed 1-7-04 having been found not persuasive.

The examiner objected to claims 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, and 14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

By amendment above applicant has cancelled claims 1 and 3.

By amendment above applicant has rewritten claim 4 in independent form to include the limitations of (now cancelled) claim 1 upon which it had been dependent.

By amendment above applicant has rewritten claims 5, 7, 10, 11, 13 and 14 to be dependent on now independent claim 4.

By amendment above applicant has also rewritten rejected claims 8 and 9, previously dependent on rejected claim 1, to be dependent on now independent claim 4. As such, dependent claims for a further element of an allowable claim, these claims should be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments above, and the remarks pertaining to them, are fully responsive to the Office action and place the application in allowable condition. Passing the application to allowance and issue would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward J. Kaliski
Registration Number 28,622

DATED: May 7, 2004

One Gracie Terrace -12E
New York, NY 10028

Phone and fax (212) 879-3599